

you can see the animals are having a little bit of concern about how they could be trapped by the fire.

That cuts into the tourism. People don't go home and tell about the great experience they had. They go home and tell about the extreme pressure they were under with fires. Consequently, they spread the advertising in a very negative way. We want it to be in a positive way.

There are things that can be done and that should be done. I will be taking some more time to explain what they are and steps that are being taken by the Forest Service at the moment. But more extensive steps need to be taken.

Senator DASCHLE has an amendment on a supplemental spending bill to take care of some of the problems bordering Wyoming in the Black Hills. It very explicitly allows them to go in and cut down those trees, which will reduce the amount of tinder. There are some ways that we can do that.

I introduced a bill, S. 2811, the Emergency Forest Rescue Act of 2002. That gives the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior the ability to recognize emergency conditions that exist in the forests and allows the land managers to act to protect them from the extreme threat of fire, specifically those suffering from drought and high tree mortality. Those two circumstances have to be present. It also requires the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality.

I have some protections built in and some ability to move forward quickly so we don't burn up huge valleys and extend the fire into Yellowstone Park, which is one of our great natural treasures. In fact, all of our forests should be national treasures. Present conditions do not make them as usable as they could be or as pretty as they could be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 20 minutes under the order.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Alaska would like to use the last 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized for the final 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in the coming days I assume there will be a lot of suspender-snapping, back-thumping, chortling, and crowing about the

new fast track trade agreement that was announced in the weekend press.

There was a conference in the House and Senate. They came out with a new trade agreement. The moniker is trade promotion authority. It is a fancy way of saying fast-track trade authority for President Bush.

I didn't support fast track trade authority for President Clinton, and I don't support it for President Bush. This is not a victory for our country.

I assume, this week, because the conference report has passed the House, it will come to the Senate. We will have speeches by people wearing dark suits who talk about how wonderful this is for our country, what a wonderful thing it is that we now have fast-track trade authority. So some of our trade negotiators can go overseas somewhere, go into a room, close the door, lock it, keep the public out, and negotiate in secret a new trade agreement, and then come back to the Congress and say: Here it is. Take it or leave it. No amendments. Up or down. No changes.

The people who apparently believe in this do not believe in the first law of holes; that is, when you find yourself in a hole, stop digging. They believe, if you find yourself in a hole, keep digging, look for more shovels.

Let me talk for a moment about where we are with our trade deficits. This chart shows the record trade deficits we have seen over the past decade. When the year 2002 figures are posted, they will be way off the chart up here: about a \$480 billion trade deficit in goods. That is money we owe to others, money we owe to people outside this country. They will have a future claim on America's income. This is very serious for our country. Yet we have people walking around here saying: We just need to do more of the same.

One of the more recent trade agreements we did was NAFTA. They promised us hundreds of thousands of new jobs, if we melded the economies of the United States and Mexico, for trade purposes. I have a chart that shows what has happened as a result of NAFTA: 700,000 jobs lost.

Incidentally, prior to NAFTA, we had a very small trade surplus with Mexico. After NAFTA, we turned that small surplus into a huge deficit. We had a modest trade deficit with Canada. It turned into a very large deficit. So we have this very large trade deficit now with Canada and Mexico, and people say: Gosh, that is wonderful; isn't it? No, it is not wonderful. It is moving in the wrong direction.

It is not that I don't believe in the global economy and the ability of nations and businesses to exchange goods and services back and forth. I studied economics, taught economics for a while, and understand the doctrine of comparative advantage: Doing that which you do best, and trading with others who do what they do best. All of that makes sense to me.

But I also think the rules have to be fair, and open markets have to be

opened. The rules have to be transparent and fair. And they are not.

If I might just give some examples of these rules and the problems with the rules.

I use, often, the example of automobile trade with Korea. Korea is a good friend of the United States. South Korea has been an ally of ours for some long while. We have a trading relationship with Korea. But let me show you what has happened between the United States and Korea in one area of trade.

Last year, the Koreans shipped 618,000 cars into the United States—Hyundais, Daewoos—Korean cars. So 618,000 Korean cars came here from Korea, and we were able to ship Korea 2,800 cars; in other words, 217 to 1. Is it because our cars are bad cars? No, that is not it. It is because if you try to ship a Ford Mustang to Korea, they will throw up all kinds of trade barriers. They just do not want United States cars shipped to Korea. They want only for Korean cars to access the American marketplace.

Is that fair? No, it is not fair. Does anybody in this country have the backbone and nerve to stand up to another country and say to them: Look, we like you a lot. You are allies of ours. We are good friends. But I will tell you what. In international trade, we have a notion of fairness. Open your markets to us, and we will open our markets to you. But if you close your markets to the United States, ship your cars to Nigeria or perhaps Iran, and see how quickly they sell.

Let's talk about beef exports to Europe. Go to Europe. The Presiding Officer has been in Europe. Pick up a newspaper in Europe—I have been there this year—and you read about European trade restrictions on U.S. beef, allegedly because of hormones. The way they picture it, it is as if we are shipping them beef that came from cows with two heads. That is the way it is portrayed in the European press. They keep United States beef out of Europe.

So our country actually tried to do something about that. We said: Look, you either allow United States beef into Europe or we are going to take action against you. So, finally, a little bit of backbone from our trade representatives, right? Finally, we have some nerve. Finally, we have the good old American spirit and we are going to stand up for our producers. We couldn't get beef into Europe, so we took action.

Our trade representatives filed a case at the WTO against the Europeans for their restrictions on our beef. The WTO actually ruled on it, which itself is a surprise. The WTO said: Europe, you are wrong. You must allow United States beef into Europe. Europe said: It doesn't matter. We are not going to do it. So our trade negotiators said: We are going to take action against the Europeans. Do you know what we are going to do? We are going to retaliate by imposing tariffs on European truffles, goose livers, and Roquefort cheese.

Now, that will strike fear in any country, won't it? They will not allow our beef in Europe, but we are going to make it tough for them. We are going to take action against truffles, goose livers, and Roquefort cheese. Good for us.

When, on Earth, will we have the nerve to say to other countries, we demand—we insist—on fair trade?

Twelve years ago we reached an agreement with Japan on beef. All the trade negotiators celebrated as if they just won the 100-yard dash in the Olympics, as if they were all wearing gold medals because we reached a trade agreement with Japan on beef. But 12 years later, every single pound of American beef going into Japan still bears a 38.5-percent tariff.

Try to send T-bones to Tokyo, a 37.5-percent tariff—every pound of beef. We have a \$60 to \$70 billion trade deficit with Japan, yet we cannot get beef into Japan without a tariff near 40 percent. It doesn't make any sense to me.

This issue goes on and on. In my part of the country, we face an avalanche of unfairly subsidized Canadian grain coming in from a monopoly called the Canadian Wheat Board. We can't do a thing about it because the last trade agreement that came through here limited our remedies under section 301. We don't do a thing about it, so this grain floods into our country from Canada. It is unfair.

Our Canadian friends, they are good friends of ours, but they are not playing fair with respect to trade and grain. So U.S. wheat producers, family farmers, put together the information to file a complaint. They won the complaint. The U.S. Trade Representative judged that the Canadians, through the Canadian Wheat Board, are engaged in unfair trade.

What is the remedy? Well, apparently, according to our trade ambassador, the remedy is just to say that the Canadians ought to really watch it. No tariffs. No effective actions. No sanctions. Just: You had better watch it. That is not the way to deal with international trade.

When this so-called fast-track authority agreement was reached in conference, the committee of jurisdiction issued a memorandum describing what they did in conference and what a terrific deal it is.

Trade adjustment assistance: They tripled it. That provides assistance with health insurance for displaced workers. So if you lose your job because of these trade agreements, guess what? We are going to exchange for your job some health insurance for you. Boy, that is quite a deal, isn't it?

We are going to expand coverage to secondary workers who are affected by a firm moving overseas. These trade agreements make it easier to move a firm overseas, so if you lose your job, and if you are not a primary worker but a secondary worker, we are going to cover you for the first time. That is going to make you feel really good as

you go home and tell your family: I have lost my job. But guess what. I am a secondary worker, and I think I am covered with some health insurance for a while. I think I am going to get a little health insurance here.

There is a pilot program for providing wage insurance for older workers, realizing the difficulty for older workers to change careers. Why would you to have change a career? Because your job just went to Sri Lanka or Bangladesh or Indonesia, where they are going to do for 20 cents an hour what you did for a living wage in this country.

There is a new benefit for farmers and ranchers who have been losing money hand over fist because of price collapses. If they lose money now because of these new trade agreements, there is a little help for them. Somebody takes their market away, we give them just a little bit of help in trade adjustment assistance. Lose your job? Lose your farm? Lose your ranch? Guess what. We will help you out a little.

The issue, according to these folks, is not about fair trade. The fight is about how can we provide assistance to Americans who are going to lose their jobs.

For me, the question is this: What are the elements of fair trade? What is price for admission to the American marketplace? We fought for a century about fair labor standards, about not having children go down in coal mines, and not having children work in factories, about requiring safe workplaces, about a minimum wage, about the right to organize. Then some companies decided: We can skip all of that. We can pole vault over all those things. We can hire someone in Indonesia and pay them 24 cents an hour to make shoes. We don't have to worry about all those things we had to worry about in the United States.

When we in the Senate were debating the current fast track bill in May, the Presiding Officer offered an amendment which I cosponsored, the Dayton-Craig amendment. It said: If in the next negotiation, there is any attempt to weaken the remedies for American producers, countervailing duties, any number of remedies to take action against unfair trade, if that is the case, there is going to be a separate vote in the Congress on that. The amendment passed in the Senate by a wide, bipartisan vote. Sixty one Senators voted for it. But when the bill got to conference, the provision got dropped, just got dropped. Instead, we got the right to do a sense-of-the-Senate vote. Well, thank you very much. You could do that before, and the new provision does nothing to defend our trade laws. It doesn't mean anything. If you just like to be here and put your suit and necktie on to vote for the heck of it, be our guest, come and do it, but this doesn't mean anything. They dropped an effective provision from the Senate version of the trade bill, one that would have helped producers in this country.

They also dropped my amendment that said on investor dispute resolutions in NAFTA, proceedings must be open, they must be transparent. The door must be open. The public must see it. Now it is done in secrecy.

They dropped my amendment. They dropped anything that was good. Then they put a sort of chocolate coating on things that were bad, sent it out here, and said: Hope that tastes good. Well, it doesn't taste good. This doesn't make any sense to us.

It is interesting, there is only one view of trade that you can embrace these days. We have the largest trade deficit in history; last month over \$41 billion—last month alone. A lot of major papers won't run a piece on the trade deficit on their op-ed page because there is only one view on their op-ed pages: You are either for global trade or you are against it. If you are against it, you are some sort of xenophobic isolationist stooge who just doesn't get it. Everybody else sees over the horizon. Those who oppose fast track don't.

That is one of the most thoughtless approaches to a trade debate I can imagine. We will have a lengthier discussion on this, this week. I will have much more to say.

Let me say again, I believe expanded trade is helpful to this country provided expanded trade is fair trade. We have been victimized in so many ways by so many trade agreements—recently, NAFTA and the WTO. You name it, I will show you the trade agreement that has expanded our trade deficit, hurt our producers, moved our jobs overseas, and nobody seems to care very much. Do you hear one peep on the floor of the Senate about the largest trade deficit in history? Just one? I don't hear a thing. Yet it hurts this country. It is going to cause this country serious economic problems in the future.

I have so much more to say today, and so little time to say it. I want the Senator from Alaska to have the opportunity to speak for the last 5 minutes. So when this legislation comes to the floor of the Senate, I will speak at greater length later in the week. In the meantime, suffice it to say, some of us don't celebrate as much as others when they talk about the ingredients of this conference report on fast track. This is not advancing our country's interest. It is not fair to producers and to workers.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank Senator DORGAN for his courtesy.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND HEADQUARTERS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I, along with General Joe Ralston, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe,